

The Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa

A Study of the Earliest Upaniṣad, Belonging to the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda

A Summary of the doctoral dissertation by
Masato FUJII

Institute for Asian and African Studies, University of Helsinki
October 2004

1. Purpose of the Dissertation

The present dissertation consists of eleven articles which as a whole form a comprehensive study of the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa (hereafter JUB), a Vedic prose text in the category of philosophical texts called Upaniṣads. As its title states, the JUB belongs to the Jaiminīya school of the Sāmaveda ‘the knowledge (*veda*) of sacred ritual chants (*sāman*)’ — the collective name for the whole chanting traditions including texts and performances — which, together with other three Vedas (Ṛgveda, Yajurveda, Atharvaveda), constitute the orthodox religious canons in ancient India. The Vedic canons consist of two literary genres: the basic collections, called Saṃhitās, of the ritual hymns (*ṛc*), chants (*sāman*), and formulae (*yajus*); and the explanatory texts, Brāhmaṇas by name, describing the procedures and the meanings of various rituals including the Soma sacrifices (i.e. the ritual complexes with the plant Soma as the central offering substance). To the explanatory texts are appended special texts of mysterious or speculative character as their independent supplements or final chapters, entitled Āraṇyakas or Upaniṣads. The JUB is one of the texts of this kind, appended to the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa of the same school. Among the texts of this kind, which more or less reflect a profound shift of Vedic ritual and textual orientation from action to meaning, the JUB occupies an important position as one of the texts which opened the doors to philosophy. As will become clear in the dissertation, the JUB is the earliest of the texts which were produced as Upaniṣads in the history of Vedic literature. The main purpose of the present dissertation is to elucidate the ritual and textual backgrounds of the formation of this first Upaniṣad in the Sāmavedic chanting traditions, and to trace within this particular text how philosophical speculations were developed from ritual speculations — speculations on the ritual procedures and acts including Sāmavedic chants — in the priestly school of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda, through its ritual and textual relationships with other schools not only of the Sāmaveda but also of the other Vedas.

2. Importance of the Research

It is one of the distinctive features of Indian philosophy that it has one of its origins in Vedic ritual culture. It was in the Upaniṣads belonging to respective Vedic ritual schools and traditions that Indian philosophy began to take definite shape. In the history of the Upaniṣads, two fundamental questions are how the early Upaniṣads were produced from the background of the Brāhmaṇa ritual literature textually and philosophically, and what are the chronological and intertextual relationships among the early Upaniṣads and their constituent parts. To study the Upaniṣads on these two points, essential research materials are the three earliest Upaniṣads, namely, the JUB of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda, the Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad of the Vājasaneyi Yajurveda, and the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad of the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīya Sāmaveda. Among them, the JUB has been often excluded from Upaniṣads proper, because it is not included in the prevalent classification of Upaniṣads basically according to Vedāntic traditions, and because it is usually classified by present scholars into the category of (sub-)Brāhmaṇas or Āraṇyakas. [The classification of the JUB as a Brāhmaṇa or an Āraṇyaka is based on its ritual-oriented contents as well as its peculiar title, Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa. This title is in fact derived from the name of a section (“the *brāhmaṇa* ‘section’ of *upaniṣad*”) in the large JB including the JB proper, Jaiminīya-Ārṣeya-Brāhmaṇa, and JUB (see Article 3, Chap. 3), but has been misunderstood as the title for an intermediate text between Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads.] Partly for the reason of this exclusion from Upaniṣads, and partly on account of its Sāmavedic special contents, the JUB has not been studied seriously by either Upaniṣadic scholars or Vedic ritual scholars (see 3. Previous Studies). However, as a transitional text with characteristics both of a ritual text and a philosophical text, the JUB significantly represents the earliest phase in the history of the Upaniṣads. And as a text which shows abundant relations — textual, ritual and speculative — with preceding and succeeding texts both inside and outside the school to which it belongs, it affords important clues for tracing the great passage from ritual to philosophy in ancient India.

3. Previous Studies

It was in 1894 when H. Oertel published the first edition of the JUB with an English translation and notes (see [12] in References). This edition was based on the manuscripts of unknown Sāmavedic texts including the JB and JUB discovered by A. C. Burnell in South India. Although Oertel’s work represents the highest achievement at the initial stage of studies on the Jaiminīya texts, it could not escape from the limitations of both the manuscript materials and the Sāmavedic knowledge which he could use for editing and translating it. Oertel’s edition

was reproduced in Devanāgarī script in 1921 ([13]), and was incorporated with a few emendations and many notes on words and phrases in the Gandhi Memorial Edition of the Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads published in 1954 ([8]) under the title of Jaiminiya-Upaniṣad. In 1967, B. R. Sharma published another edition of the JUB ([16]), using several new manuscripts as well as Burnell's manuscripts. His edition provides not a few different and better readings, but regrettably reduces its value due to inconsistency in its treatment of materials.

The contents of the JUB have been studied only partially after the above-mentioned translation and notes by Oertel (1894 [12]) as well as the extracts published by him beforehand (1893 [11]). H. Lüders (1916 [9]) examined the parallel passages JUB 3,1–2 and ChU 4,3, and ascertained the chronological priority of the former to the latter. J. A. B. Buitenen (1955–56 [2], 1959 [3]) clarified the connection of the sacred syllable *om* with Sāmavedic chants on the basis of the JUB. A. Parpola (1982 [15]) investigated the abnormal textual divisions of the JB and JUB, together with their Sāmavedic backgrounds. I. C. Deshpande (1980 [6]) and W. Howard (1987 [7]) studied the JUB from the Sāmavedic point of view and collected the information on the *gāyatra-sāman* in it. H. W. Bodewitz (1986 [1]) analysed the first section of the JUB and elucidated the philosophical speculations there.

4. Methodology of Investigation

As a comprehensive study of the JUB, the dissertation covers its ritual, philosophical, and textual problems. Firstly, I have made a special study of Sāmavedic chants and other ritual elements mentioned in the JUB to identify the concrete ritual facts underlying the text, and to define the ritual functions, symbolisms, and speculations on the basis of which the JUB was composed. Secondly, I have analysed passages on the secret significance of ritual performances in order to elucidate especially the development of speculations on the attainment of the heavenly world as a ritual effect into speculations on rebirth after death. The development in this direction is one of the most important contributions of the JUB to Indian philosophy, and proves close connections of Vedic rebirth theories with Vedic ritualistic ideologies. Thirdly, for the sake of unraveling the process of formation and development of the text, I have distinguished several strata within it, and explored the relationships of the strata with each other and with corresponding strata of other texts both inside and outside the school. In connection with the text, I have also traced its transmission through the ages to ascertain the forms and states in which the JUB has been handed down in the history of Vedic traditions. In connection with the textual transmission of the JUB, I have collected a large number of manuscripts of the JUB including many unknown manuscripts as well as those used by Oertel and Sharma. I have made

full use of them for the present study in order to research the JUB on the basis of its highly reliable text.

5. Contents of the Dissertation and Relations of the Articles

The dissertation consists of eleven separate articles concerning various aspects of the JUB, and consequently it is better to classify the articles into groups and to rearrange them within the groups not in chronological order but according to the content so that they will represent properly their relations with each other as well as their positions in the whole dissertation. Corresponding to the above-mentioned three approaches — ritual, philosophical and textual — to the JUB, the articles can be classified into the following three groups (the bibliographical details of the articles will be given in 6. Summary of the Articles):

1. Sāmavedic ritual background of the JUB

Article 1: “On the unexpressed *gāyatra-sāman* in the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa.”

Article 2: “The *Gāyatra-Sāman*: Chanting Innovations in Sāmavedic Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣad.”

Article 3: ‘On the Formation and Transmission of the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa.’
Ch. 1. The *sāman* tradition as a background of the JUB.

2. Ritual and philosophical speculations in the JUB

Article 4: “The *Bahiṣpavamāna* Ritual of the Jaiminīyas.”

Article 5: “The *Gāyatra* and Ascension to Heaven (Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 1,1–7; 3,11–14).”

Article 6: “Nidōsetsu no seiritsu —kōkivēda no saiseisetsu— (On the Formation of the *Devayāna* and *Pitryāna* Theory)” (in Japanese).

3. Textual formation and transmission of the JUB

Article 3: “On the Formation and Transmission of the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa.”

Ch. 2. The formation of the JUB, Ch. 3. The transmission of the JUB.

Article 7: “Three Notes on the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 3,1–5.”

Article 8: “A Common Passage on the Supreme Prāṇa in the Three Earliest Upaniṣads (JUB 1,60–2,12; BĀU 1,3; ChU 1,2).”

Article 9: “The Brahman Priest (Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 3,15–19).”

Article 10: “The Brahman Priest in the History of Vedic Texts.”

Article 11: “Kena-Upaniṣad (= Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 4,10 [4,18–21])”
(in Japanese).

The first three articles (Articles 1–3) are concerned with the Sāmavedic ritual background of the JUB. The first article demonstrates that one particular chant called *gāyatra-sāman*, especially its unexpressed (*anirukta*) form, is the main theme of the JUB. The second article traces the changes of the *gāyatra-sāman* in the history of the Sāmavedic texts from the Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa to the JUB for the purpose of answering the question why the Jaiminīyas chose this particular *sāman* as the main theme when they composed their first Upaniṣad. The third article (in its first chapter) explains that the difference in the treatment of the *gāyatra-sāman* between the JUB and ChU reflects the difference in the importance of this particular *sāman* within the chanting traditions to which the JUB and ChU belong.

The next three articles (Articles 4–6) deal with the ritual and philosophical speculations in and behind the JUB. The fourth article describes the opening laud (*bahiṣpavamāna-stotra*) in the Soma sacrifices, in which the *gāyatra-sāman* is sung, and elucidates the central symbolism underlying this ritual act, on which are based the following speculations on the *gāyatra-sāman* in the JUB. The fifth article compares two passages on the ascension to the heavenly world by means of the unexpressed form of *gāyatra-sāman* in the first and third chapters of the JUB (1,1–7; 3,11–14) to make clear the difference in the basic ideas behind the similar speculations in the different strata of the text. The sixth article expounds the development of speculations on the *gāyatra-sāman* into rebirth theories as early forms of the well-known *devayāna* and *pitṛyāna* theory.

The remaining five articles (Articles 7–11), together with the second and third chapters of the third article, treat various problems about the formation and transmission of the JUB. The second chapter of the third article explains the textual formation of the JUB and its relationships with other texts inside and outside the Jaiminīya school. The third chapter of the same article discusses the transmission of the JUB through the post-Vedic period up to the present. The seventh article scrutinises the opening section of the third chapter of the JUB (3,1–5) to probe for a later stratum of the text. The eighth article analyses all the versions of a common passage in the three earliest Upaniṣads (JUB 1,60–2,12; BĀU 1,3; ChU 1,2) to determine the chronological relationships among the versions. The ninth article compares the passage on the functions of the Brahman priest in the JUB (3,15–19) with its parallel passages in other Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads to find the textual and ritual relationships of the Jaiminīyas with other schools. The tenth article, as a development of the ninth article, extensively examines the passages on the two main functions of the Brahman priest and traces the process through

which his office was established in the history of Vedic texts and schools. The last, eleventh article presents a critical edition of the KenaU portion of the JUB (4,18–21) on the basis of manuscripts of the JUB, and discusses the position of this portion in the JUB, especially its relations to the succeeding portions (4,22–26; 27–28).

5. Summary of the Articles

Article 1:

“On the unexpressed *gāyatra-sāman* in the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa.” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 2, 1984, pp. 1123–1121 (1–3).

This article ascertains the main ritual theme of the JUB by identifying two obscure words in the text, *anṛca sāman* ‘verseless chant’ and *aśarīra sāman* ‘bodiless chant’. The former word occurs in a passage of conflict between the gods and the Asuras (1,15–16), where it is told that this special chant, by means of which the gods attained the heavenly world, should be sung at the morning Soma-pressing, but not at the other two Soma-pressings. The latter word is found in a dialogue between the king Keśin Dārbhya and his deceased uncle (3,29–31), in which the uncle who does not have his body tells his nephew that a Brahman made him shake off his body by singing the *udgītha* with the bodiless *sāman*.

The three Soma-pressings in the Soma sacrifices are accompanied with a certain number of lauds (*stotra*) by the chanter priests, in which some verses are sung with the replacement of the main part by repeated monosyllables: *o vā o vā o vā hum bhā o vā*. The replacement by the monosyllables, which is called *anirukta gāna* ‘unexpressed chanting’, takes place only in verses chanted in the melody of the *gāyatra-sāman*, that is, in all the verses of every laud at the morning pressing and in the first three verses of the first lauds at the midday and evening pressings. This fact leads us to identify the *anṛca sāman* and *aśarīra sāman* as the unexpressed form of the *gāyatra-sāman* in the Soma sacrifices.

The unexpressed form of the *gāyatra-sāman* is recorded in its full form or fragmentary forms in various places in the JUB, including the two passages which end with genealogical lists of teachers (*vaṁśa*) (3,38–42; 4,11–17), where this special *sāman* is treated as a divine doctrine handed down from the gods to the sages. The ending words of the second passage clearly show that the *gāyatra-sāman* is the main theme of the JUB as follows: *saiṣā śāṭyāyanī gāyatrasyopaniṣad evam upāsitavyā* “This Śāṭyāyani’s Upaniṣad of the *gāyatra*(-*sāman*) should be worshipped thus” (4,17,2).

Article 2:

“The *Gāyatra-Sāman*: Chanting Innovations in Sāmavedic Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣad.”

To be published in the Proceedings of the Second International Vedic Workshop, Kyoto, 31 October – 2 November, 1999.

Between the two early Upaniṣads of the Sāmaveda, JUB and ChU, a fundamental difference exists with regard to their attitudes toward one particular *sāman* called *gāyatra*. The *gāyatra-sāman*, especially its unexpressed form, is the main theme of the JUB (see Article 1), while it does not have any special significance in the ChU in spite of the close textual parallelism of the two texts. Since the JUB chronologically precedes the ChU, whose first four chapters are modelled upon the JUB, there arises the question of why the Jaiminīyas chose this particular *sāman* as the main theme when they composed the first Sāmavedic Upaniṣad. To answer this question, the present article traces the changes of the *gāyatra-sāman* in the history of Sāmavedic texts. The texts concerned here are the PB and Ṣaḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa of the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīya Sāmaveda, the JB and JUB of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda.

The *gāyatra-sāman* is used for all the verses of every laud (*stotra*) in the morning pressing service, and for the first three verses of the first lauds in the midday and third pressing services. In connection with the first laud called *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra*, the Sāmavedic Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣad explain the *gāyatra-sāman* in detail but in different ways. For the *gāyatra-sāman* in the first laud, the PB gives a brief explanation (PB 6,8–7,1), in which this *sāman* occurs in a relatively simple form. The JB has much longer explanation for the *gāyatra-sāman* of the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* (JB 1,87–104; 111–115; 259–273; 315–321). The text can be divided into two parts: [1,87–96; 111–115] and [1,97–104; 259–273; 315–321]. The first part offers almost the same explanation as the PB. The second part is exclusively concerned with the *dhurs*, which are the modified forms of the *gāyatra-sāman* adopted in the first six verses of the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* and in some verses of the next *ājya-stotras*. To the six *dhur* verses of the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra*, the JB gives the following special names: 1. *retasyā*, 2. *gāyatrī*, 3. *triṣṭubh*, 4. *jagatī*, 5. *anuṣṭubh*, 6. *pañkti*. In spite of their metrical names, except the first, *retasyā*, the *dhurs* have many more features than simple metrical modifications. In the present article, I have collected the information on the *dhurs* in the JB and reconstructed them on the basis of it. The ṢaḍvB describes the six *dhurs* in a remarkably similar way to the JB, but more concisely (2,1–3). This supplementary Brāhmaṇa shows that the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīyas secondarily adopted the *dhurs* there under the influence of the *dhurs* established by the Jaiminīyas in the second part on the *gāyatra-sāman* of the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* in the JB. The Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīyas have preserved the *dhurs* in their Śrautasūtras (LŚS 7,12–13 = DŚS 21,3–4). The *dhurs* of the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīyas are also reconstructed in the article.

The Jaiminīyas, however, again developed a new way of chanting the *gāyatra-sāman*, that is, the unexpressed form of the *gāyatra-sāman* with repeated monosyllables: *o vā o vā o vā hum bhā o vā*. Since this special *gāyatra* makes its first appearance in the JUB as a secret doctrine, it can be concluded that the Jaiminīyas composed the JUB primarily in order to introduce, and explain the significance of, the new unexpressed form of the *gāyatra*. This unexpressed form of the *gāyatra-sāman* has been handed down in the Jaiminīya traditions as the unique form of the *gāyatra-sāman* used in the Soma sacrifices up to the present, and the JUB itself has been treated as the authority for it.

Article 3:

“On the Formation and Transmission of the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa.” In: Michael Witzel (ed.), *Inside the Texts, Beyond the Texts: New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas*, [Harvard Oriental Series, Opera Minora, 2], Cambridge, 1997, pp. 89–102.

1. The first chapter of this article deals with the difference in the *sāman* traditions which underlie the JUB and ChU. The ChU has so many passages parallel to the JUB that they look “comme une variante de JUB” (Renou, *JAOS* 73, p. 140, n. 3). A closer examination, however, reveals not only the chronological posteriority of the ChU to the JUB, but also a fundamental difference in content between them. The JUB centers its speculations on the unexpressed form of the *gāyatra-sāman* (see Article 1) which is first introduced in the JUB (see Article 2). The ChU, in contrast, does not specify the *gāyatra* as its subject, nor does it make the slightest reference to the unexpressed form of the *gāyatra-sāman*.

This thematic difference between the two Upaniṣads is connected with a difference in the *sāman* traditions of the two schools to which the Upaniṣads belong. The latter difference is known from the *vratas* (observances to follow when studying Vedic texts) of Sāmavedic students and the *sāmans* to be studied during the periods of the respective *vratas*. The Gṛhyasūtras of both Sāmavedic schools order the *aupaniṣada-vrata* as one of the *vratas*. The Āraṇyakagāna of the Kauthumas, nevertheless, does not record the *sāmans* to be studied during the period of that *vrata*, while the Jaiminīya-Āraṇyakagāna assigns to the *aupaniṣada-vrata* nineteen *sāmans* which include the *gāyatra* as the last one. This fact indicates that the Jaiminīyas give special importance to the *gāyatra* as the *sāman* into which students are initiated at the final stage. The Jaiminīyas’ creation of the first Sāmavedic Upaniṣad on the subject of the *gāyatra* influenced the rival school to compose their own Upaniṣad, i.e., the ChU, after the model of the JUB. But on account of the difference in the *sāman* traditions, especially with regard to the *gāyatra*, the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīyas remodelled the original speculations on the *gāyatra-sāman* into the speculations on *sāmans* in general or at least the *sāman* unspecified.

2. The second chapter explains the textual formation of the JUB and its relationships with other texts inside and outside the Jaiminīya school, which can be summarised as follows:

- The JUB consists of three independent parts: 1–3; 4,1–17; 4,18–28. The first two parts end with different genealogical lists of teachers (*vaṃśa*).
- JUB 1–3 borrows much from the JB (especially from the Agniṣṭoma-portion 1,66–364).
- JUB 1–3 can be further divided into two strata, 1–2 and 3, according to the contents.
- JUB 1,60–2,12, BĀU 1,3, and ChU 1,2 are parallel passages in this chronological order (see Article 9). Besides this, the first four chapters of the ChU have many parallels with the JUB, while the BĀU shows no clear relationships with the JUB except with JUB 4,18–21 (KenaU).
- JUB 1–3 shows, in many places, close relationships with Aitareya texts.
- JUB 1–2 does not have textual relations with the Kauṣītakins. A contact with them is first seen in JUB 3,4,5 (see Article 8).
- JUB 4,18–21 (KenaU), 22–26, and 27–28 are later appendices, probably collected there for educational purposes (see Article 12).

In the process of the formation of the JUB and the related texts, they underwent parallel developments in mutual relationships over a long span of time. The earliest stratum of the JUB (1,1–2,15), for example, has textual connections with the Aitareyas, and a contact with the Kauṣītakins is first seen in the next stratum (JUB 3,4,5 ~ ŚāṅkhĀ 1,5). The later texts of the Kauṣītakins show direct influences of the Jaiminīyas. Probably the Ṛgvedic school related with the Sāmavedic Jaiminīyas was changed from the Aitareyas to the Kauṣītakins in the later stage of the formation of the JUB.

3. The third chapter discusses the transmission of the JUB. In the post-Vedic period, the KenaU portion of the JUB (4,18–21) was classified as an authentic Upaniṣad by Vedāntins. But according to Śāṅkara's commentary on the KenaU, it was still considered to be a part (allegedly, the beginning part of the ninth section) of the text which, from his explanation, covered the JB, the JĀrṣB, and the JUB. At the same time, as is explicitly stated by Śāṅkara in his commentary on the Brahmasūtra on the distinction between JUB 4,1–17 and the KenaU portion, and by Bhavatrāta in his commentary on the Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra on two Gāyatra-Upaniṣads (i.e. JUB 1,1–3,42 and 4,1–17), the three parts of the JUB (1,1–3,42; 4,1–17; 4,18–28) were treated as independent texts. It is not certain when the three texts came to be considered to form a single book under the name of Talavakāra-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa or Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad. In the Jaiminīya school, the JUB has been handed down up to the present as a text to be studied for the period of the *aupaniṣada-vrata*. Unlike the ChU, the JUB has not been acknowledged

to be an Upaniṣad by Vedāntins except the KenaU portion, so that it has been kept within the small circle of the Jaiminīya tradition and has not attained any popularity outside the school.

Article 4:

“The *Bahiṣpavamāna* Ritual of the Jaiminīyas.” *Machikaneyama Ronso* (Philosophy), Vol. 20, 1986, pp. 3–25.

The *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* ‘the outdoor laud for [the Soma] which is purifying itself’ is the first of a certain number of lauds chanted by the three chanter priests (*udgātṛ*, *prastotṛ*, *pratiharṛ*) on the main day in the Soma sacrifices. As its name states, this laud is chanted not in the *sadas* hut where the other lauds are chanted, but outdoors at the northeastern border of the sacrificial place. Why is only the first laud to be chanted outside at that place in particular? This article gives an answer to this question, which is closely connected with the central ritual symbolism underlying the Soma sacrifices. For this purpose, it describes every ritual act of the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* on the basis of all the available materials including the Jaiminīya texts (JB, JUB, JŚS, Bhavatrāta’s commentary on JŚS), which were not used by Caland and Henry in their description of the Agniṣṭoma ([5]). The article also provides an annotated translation of the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* part of the JŚS.

In the ritual symbolism of the Soma sacrifices, the sacrificial place represents the heavenly world in which the main ritual acts are to be performed, and the boundary of the sacrificial place is regarded as that between the heavenly world and this world. As the opening ritual on the main day of the Soma sacrifices, the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* consists of several meaningful ritual acts including the creeping northwards by the sacrificer and the priests up to the *cātvāla* pit at the northeastern border of the sacrificial place, which pit is symbolically identified with the sun as the entrance to the heavenly world; the chanter priests’ chanting the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* near the *cātvāla* pit after the creeping; the sacrificer’s bestriding the northern boundary of the sacrificial place; and the priests’ lifting up their arms. Those acts of the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* as a whole symbolise the procession to the heavenly world, where the sacrifice of the divine Soma will be held, and where the sacrificer and the priests will partake of the Soma together with the gods. On this ritual symbolism are based the JUB’s speculations of the ascension to the heavenly world by means of the unexpressed form of the *gāyatra-sāman* (see Article 5 below).

Article 5:

“The *Gāyatra* and Ascension to Heaven (Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 1,1–7; 3,11–14).”
Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies, Vol. 35, No. 2, 1987, pp. 1005–1002 (16–19).

To the unexpressed form of the *gāyatra-sāman*, which is called *aśarīra gāyatra* ‘bodiless *gāyatra*’ (body = verse), the JUB gives the following philosophical significance: by reason of its bodilessness, it makes a person for whom it is sung go beyond the mortality of his corporeal existence and attain immortality in the heavenly world. Among the passages on the bodiless *gāyatra* in the JUB, the two sections 1,1–7 and 3,11–14 describe the whole process of leading a person to the heavenly world. The two passages show a striking parallelism in their structures, under which they conceal the shape of the bodiless *gāyatra*. Every paragraph of both passages corresponds to each of the following divisions of the *gāyatra-sāman*: *o vā / o vā / o vā / hum bhā / o vā*. Both the passages narrate almost the same process of ascension to the heavenly world step by step by means of each division of the bodiless *gāyatra*, and at the end of the process they have in common a dialogue between the deity (probably the sun) and the person who has ascended.

In spite of their parallel structure and similar content, however, they show a fundamental difference in the basic ideas on which they built up their ascension theories. In brief, the speculation in 1,1–7 was developed from the ritual symbolism of the procession to the heavenly world at the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* in the Soma sacrifices (see Article 4), while that in 3,11–14 was based on the crematory concept of a deceased person’s going up with smoke from the crematory ground to the other world.

Article 6:

“Nidōsetsu no seiritsu —kōkivēda no saiseisetsu— (On the Formation of the *Devayāna* and *Pitṛyāna* Theory)” (in Japanese). *The Journal of the Nippon Buddhist Research Association*, Vol. 55, 1990, pp. 43–56.

This article analyses the passages on rebirth in the JUB which shed new light on the early history of the formation of the well-known theory of the *devayāna* and the *pitṛyāna*, the two paths, one of which a person follows after his death.

The *devayāna* and *pitṛyāna* theory originated in the concept of ascension to the heavenly world ritually or posthumously which has been developed within Vedic ritual speculations. The opening passage of the JUB (1,1–7) describes the sacrificer’s heavenly ascension to attain immortality by means of the unexpressed form of the *gāyatra-sāman* (see Article 5). As in the earlier versions of the *devayāna* and *pitṛyāna* theory found in the JB (1,17–18; 46; 49–50;

cf. KauṣU 1), this passage also includes the following dialogue between a deity as the heavenly gatekeeper (probably the sun) and the person who has ascended to the heavenly world: To the deity who is driving away [every person], saying: “You have done this evil on earth. You must not pass here,” he should say in reply: “You saw what I did. You are the doer of that [deed]” (JUB 1,5,1–2). Here the dialogue has the same intention as the dialogues in the JB: to examine whether the person knows his identity with the supreme being. The JUB has another passage of the sacrificer’s going to the heavenly world by means of the same unexpressed form of the *gāyatra-sāman* (3,11–14). This passage, however, describes the ascension as a rebirth after death, as follows: “Thus [by means of the third *o vā* of the *gāyatra-sāman*], [the priest] makes him (the sacrificer) thrive with the faith with which they lay him in the fire: ‘This one will be born from this [fire into the other world] (cf. ChU 5,9,2),’ and gives him the world into which he is born [after death]” (JUB 3,11,7). The passage also adds a dialogue between the sun and the deceased (JUB 3,14,1–5), which is exactly the same as the dialogue in JB 1,18. Undoubtedly, the JUB borrowed the dialogue from the JB, because it is told in both texts that if the person gives a wrong answer to the sun, the sun returns the self (*ātman*) to him, though the sending of the self to the sun has been related beforehand only in the JB, not in the JUB. These two passages in the JUB on the heavenly ascension by means of the *gāyatra-sāman* (1,1–7; 3,11–14) probably belong to different strata in the text, and the latter seems to be a later development as a combination of the concept of heavenly ascension as a ritual effect in the former passage and the speculations on rebirth after death developed in connection with the Agnihotra and the funeral rite in the JB.

In the *devayāna* and *pitryāna* theory, the deceased is said to go through various temporal and spatial entities such as the day and the moon. The earlier version of this theory in the JB (1,49) narrates only one path for the deceased instead of the two separate paths in the later versions. According to it, the deceased goes from the crematory fire to his final goal (the sun), through the following entities: the smoke, the night, the day, the half-month of the waning moon, the half-month of the waxing moon, the month, the seasons, the father and the grandfathers, and finally the sun. In the later versions in the BĀU (BAUK 6,2,15-16 = SBM 14,9,1,18-19) and the ChU (5,10), the entities are divided into two opposing groups, bright and dark, which form the *devayāna* (the path to the gods) and the *pitryāna* (the path to the fathers) respectively. For what purpose does the deceased pass through the temporal and spatial entities? In Vedic texts, day and night represent the finite and recurring time of this world, while the year symbolizes the eternity of the heavenly world. This symbolism may suggest that the deceased’s journey through the temporal entities means his gradual transition from the

finite temporal world to the eternal timeless world. But this is not the original meaning of the deceased's passing through the entities, which include not only temporal but also spatial ones. The JUB has a passage which seems to preserve the original meaning of the deceased's journey through the entities (3,20–28). According to it, the deceased visits the following entities and regains his vital functions from each of them: the earth, the fire, the wind, the intermediate region, the quarters, day and night, the half-months, the months, the seasons, the year, the heavenly Gandharvas, the Apsarases, the sky, the gods, the sun, and the moon. Here the deceased's journey through the entities represents the gradual process of his bodily recovery after death by getting back every vital function which has been deposited in the corresponding cosmic entity. In the later *devayāna* and *pitṛyāna* theory, however, the entities through which the deceased passes are limited mostly to temporal ones, and, as a result, the central meaning of the deceased's journey through the cosmic entities looks to be shifted, from the deceased's gradual recovery of his lost body on the way to his final destination, to the deceased's gradual transition from this temporal world to the eternal yonder world.

According to the established *devayāna* and *pitṛyāna* theory, the person who follows the *pitṛyāna* finally returns to be born again on earth (as a form of transmigration). The return from the other world to this world is not clearly mentioned in the earlier versions of the theory. In this respect, also, the JUB represents the intermediate stage of the formation of the theory. The present passage in the JUB (3,20–28) ends with the noteworthy statement that the deceased who has reached the moon or the sun as the world of Brahman can be born, if he wishes, again on earth (3,28,4).

Article 7:

“Three Notes on the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 3,1–5.” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 2, 1989, pp. 1002–994 (23–31).

This article examines the opening section of the third chapter of the JUB (3,1–5), especially its relations with other texts. The section consists of three portions: 3,1–2 on *vāyu* and *prāṇa*, 3,3–4 on *uktha*, and 3,5 on *yukti*.

JUB 3,1–2 is parallel to, and must be a source of, ChU 4,3. Both passages comprise the same teaching on the supreme *vāyu* ‘wind’ and *prāṇa* ‘breath’ into which all the cosmic entities and the vital functions enter respectively. JUB 3,1–2, which just before has four successive parallel passages on the supreme *prāṇa* (1,60; 2,1–2; 2,3–9; 2,10–12) (see Article 9), takes up again the supreme *vāyu* and *prāṇa* as the subject, and puts forward the *sāman* as the linking concept with which the two supreme beings are identified. ChU 4,3, however, as a secondary version combined with the episode of Raikva (ChU 4,1–2), uses the gambling word *saṃvarga*

‘one who rakes up all (as the sole winner)’ as an epithet common to *vāyu* and *prāṇa* to insert the teaching into a context full of gambling imagery.

JUB 3,3–4 brings up *uktha* ‘recitation’ as its main topic. The *uktha* here should be interpreted as the *mahad uktha* recited in the Mahāvratā rite, because the JUB inserts, in 3,4,5, the formulae to be uttered by the Hotṛ in the Mahāvratā prescribed in the Śāṅkhāyana-Āraṇyaka and Śāṅkhāyana-Śrautasūtra. The present passage has close connections with Ṛgvedic texts of both the Aitareya and Kauṣītaki (Śāṅkhāyana) schools.

JUB 3,5 refers to *yukti* ‘yoking’ as a kind of mental concentration performed by the chanter priest immediately before the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* in the Soma sacrifices. According to the text (3,5,4–5), it consists of regulation of breath and concentration of the senses of seeing and hearing in order to yoke the laud (*stoma*) which is said to spread in the atmosphere before chanting. The *yukti* here is probably the same action that Bhavatrāta refers to by the same word in a supplementary verse at the end of his commentary on the chapter on the *bahiṣpavamāna-stotra* of the JŚS as follows: *catuṣṣṭaikaṇḍa vā yuktā yuktir iti śrutau / pavamāne ’tra tāṃ kuryād udgātā prasavopari //* “That which consists of four actions or one action, mentioned as *yukti* ‘yoking’ in the Śruti text, the Udgātṛ should perform here at the *pavamāna-stotra* after the permission [by the Brahman priest]” (ed. Shastri: 44,7–8).

Article 8:

“A Common Passage on the Supreme Prāṇa in the Three Earliest Upaniṣads (JUB 1,60–2,12; BĀU 1,3; ChU 1,2).” *Zinbun: Annals of the Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University*, Vol. 34 (2), 2000, pp. 51–86.

This article analyses the unique long passage on the supreme *prāṇa* that the three earliest Upaniṣads have in common (JUB 1,60–2,12; BĀU 1,3; ChU 1,2) to determine the textual relationships among all the versions. The passage in question appears repeatedly in succession in the middle of the JUB in the form of four different versions (1,60; 2,1–2; 2,3–9; 2,10–12), while it is placed at or near the beginning of the BĀU and the ChU. Of the six versions, the BĀU version consists of the largest number of constituent portions as follows:

1. Prologue
2. The vital functions and *prāṇa*’s superiority
3. Correspondence between the vital functions and the cosmic entities
4. The kingship of the supreme *prāṇa*
5. The supreme *prāṇa* is Ayāsyā Āṅgīrasa
6. The supreme *prāṇa* is Bṛhaspati
7. The supreme *prāṇa* is the *sāman*

8. The *sva* and *suvarṇa* and *pratiṣṭhā* of the *sāman*
9. The *abhyāroha* of the *pavamāna-stotras*
10. Epilogue

The six versions have the following corresponding portions:

<i>JUB</i> ₁	JUB 1,60 (1,18,5):	1	2								
<i>JUB</i> ₂	JUB 2,1–2 (2,1,1–2):	1	2	3					6		
<i>JUB</i> ₃	JUB 2,3–9 (2,2–3):	1	2		4	5					
<i>JUB</i> ₄	JUB 2,10–12 (2,4,1–3):	1	2	3	4	5				10	
<i>BĀU</i>	BĀUK 1,3 (ŚBM 14,4,1):	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>ChU</i>	ChU 1,2:	1	2		4	5	6				10

The article expounds each portion of the passage with a translation of all the versions in the three Upaniṣads. A full analysis of the passage in question reveals the textual and chronological relationships among its six versions as follows:

- There are close textual relationships between *JUB*₁ (1,60) and *JUB*₃ (2,3–9), and between *JUB*₂ (2,1–2) and *JUB*₄ (2,10–12). Of each pair of versions, the latter version is based on the former one. The four versions were produced in the same order of the text as a textual development within the JUB, i.e., first *JUB*₁, second *JUB*₂, third *JUB*₃ on the basis of mainly *JUB*₁ and partly *JUB*₂, finally *JUB*₄ on the basis of mainly *JUB*₂ and partly *JUB*₃.
- The BĀU version (1,3) is closely parallel to, and must be later than, the final version in the JUB. From the fact that the portions included only in the BĀU version are found before the present passages in the JUB, it may be inferred that the author of the BĀU version knew the JUB, at least, its first two chapters which contain the four versions near the end.
- The ChU version has a close relationship with the BĀU version. It is highly probable that the ChU version was made as the latest one after all the other versions had already come into existence.

Article 9:

“The Brahman Priest (Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 3,15–19).” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 2, 1991, pp. 1054–1050 (1–5).

The JUB contains a passage on the functions of the Brahman priest (3,15–19), which has closely parallel passages in many Vedic texts. According to the correspondence of their constituent parts, the parallels form three groups: AB–KB–GB, ŚB–JB, JUB–ṢaḍvB–ChU. As to the relations between the groups, the first and the second halves of AB correspond to ŚB and JUB respectively. It is likely that JUB reflects a later extension of the AB passage which is the

earliest of all the parallels. The *prāyaścitta*, i.e. expiations for ritual faults, is the topic of these passages. The absence of parallels in the Black Yajurveda accords with the fact that the Black Yajurvedic texts do not make a clear statement of the *prāyaścitta* performed by the Brahman priest.

In contrast to the *prāyaścitta*, the other function of the Brahman priest, the *prasava*, i.e. permission to the other priests to perform ritual acts, is assigned to him in all the Vedic schools. But the form of his permission differs among them. The main difference lies in the use or disuse of the special formulae called *stomabhāga* in his permission given to the three chanter priests. The formulae are used in the schools of the Black Yajurveda, the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīya Sāmaveda, and the Atharvaveda, but not in the other schools. The lack of use of the formulae in the Aitareyas, the Jaiminīyas, and the Vājasaneyins shows that these three schools have close relationships, both textual and ritual.

Article 10:

“The Brahman Priest in the History of Vedic Texts.” In: K. Karttunen & P. Koskikallio (ed.), *Vidyārṇavavandanam: Essays in Honour of Asko Parpola*, [Studia Orientalia 94], Helsinki, 2001, pp. 147–160.

This article is a development of the preceding, ninth article as an in-depth study of the office of the Brahman priest. A study on a special subject of this kind defines more clearly the place of the JUB in Vedic ritual and textual history.

The main functions of the Brahman priest in Śrauta rituals are to give the *prasava*, i.e., the permission to the other priests for their performing ritual acts, and to perform the *prāyaścitti* (or *prāyaścitta*), i.e., the expiations for ritual faults. The assignment of these two functions to the Brahman priest is not the same among Vedic ritual texts. The passages concerning these two functions of the Brahman priest in the texts from the Yajurveda-Saṃhitās to the Śrautasūtras reveal a gradual process through which the office of Brahman priest was established in the history of Vedic texts and schools.

As far as the functions of the Brahman priest in Śrauta rituals are concerned, they have been established through the following process (related texts in []):

1. The Brahman had only the function of giving the *prasava* with the *stomabhāga* formulae in the Saṃhitās of the Black Yajurveda and the Brāhmaṇa of the Kauthuma-Rāṇāyanīya Sāmaveda [TS, KS, PB].
2. The Brāhmaṇas of the Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Ṛgvedas, the White Yajurveda and the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda prescribed the *prasava* without the *stomabhāgas*, and innovated the

Brahman's *prāyaścitti* by means of the sacred utterances (*bhūr, bhuvas, svar*) [AB, KauṣB, ŚB, JB, JUB]

3. The Kauthuma-Rāṇāyaṇīya Sāmavedins, keeping the *prasava* with *stomabhāgas*, borrowed the Brahman's *prāyaścitti* from the JB and the JUB [ṢaḍvB, ChU]
4. The Brāhmaṇa of the Atharvaveda adopted the *prasava* with the *stomabhāgas* from the KS and the Brahman's *prāyaścitti* from the AB, and connected the Brahman's office to their own Veda [GB]
5. Finally, most of the Black Yajurvedic Śrautasūtras adopted the *prāyaścitti* by means of the sacred utterances [BaudhŚS, VādhŚS, ĀpŚS, HirŚS, VaikhŚS, MānŚS]

It was in the period of the Yajurvedic Saṃhitās and the Brāhmaṇas when the Brahman clearly appeared as a priest who assumes distinctive functions. The office of Brahman priest, in its early stage, was limited to the function of superintending the whole ritual proceeding by the side of the sacrificer and giving final permission to the other priests for their performances. The expiations for ritual faults were not originally included in the functions of the Brahman, but were introduced into the Brahman's office in some schools at the period of the late Brāhmaṇas. The same expiations were finally adopted in most of the schools in their Śrautasūtras. The Atharvavedins, on the basis of their special connection with the Purohita, ascribed the office of Brahman to themselves inside their circles so as to establish themselves as an authorised Vedic group in charge of a particular priesthood. This exclusive connection of the Brahman priest with the Atharvaveda, however, was not approved in wider circles, as shown by the fact that the details of the Brahman's office are prescribed in most of the Śrautasūtras of all the Vedas.

Article 11:

“Kena-Upaniṣad (= Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 4,10 [4,18–21])” (in Japanese). In: *Indian Thoughts and Buddhist Culture: Essays in Honour of Professor Junkichi Imanishi on His Sixtieth Birthday*, Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1996, pp. 842–821 (107–128).

The KenaU is a small Upaniṣad belonging to the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda. It forms a part of the fourth chapter of the JUB (4,18–21), and, at the same time, has been handed down as an independent Upaniṣad with commentaries by Śaṅkara etc. This article presents a critical edition of the KenaU on the basis of manuscripts of the JUB, and examines the position of this Upaniṣad in the process of formation of the JUB.

The KenaU (JUB 4,18–21) consists of two parts: 1–2 (4,18–19) in verse and 3–4 (4,20–21) in prose. The former part is an aphoristic text on the supreme Brahman beyond and behind the sense organs, containing verses and phrases parallel to those in the BĀU and the Īśā-Upaniṣad,

not, however, in the context of the Ātman as the latter Upaniṣads, but in the context of the Brahman (KenaU 1,2 ~ BĀU 4,4,18; KenaU 1,4 ~ ĪśāU 10; KenaU 1,5–9 ~ BĀU 3,4,1–2 etc.; KenaU 2,4 ~ ĪśāU 11; KenaU 2,4–5 ~ BĀU 4,4,13–14). The latter part is a mythical story of the transcendent Brahman as a *yakṣa*, probably based on the use of the word *yakṣá-* ‘miraculous phenomenon’ for the supreme being in the AV, BĀU, etc. (AV 10,2,32cd = 10,8,43cd; 10,7,38; VSM 34,2 [Śivasamkalpa 2]; ŚBM 11,2,3,5 = ŚBK 3,2,5,3: ŚBM 14,8,5,1 = BĀUK 5,4).

After the KenaU (JUB 4,18–21), the JUB adds two more portions at the end of the text (4,22–26; 27–28)). The first portion is a collection of fragmentary speculations on the five breaths (*prāṇa*, *apāna*, *vyāna*, *samāna*, *udāna*), enumerations of virtues, mental preparation for death (quoted in the Pitrmedha section of the unpublished Vādhūla-Gṛhyasūtra recently found by Y. Ikari), etc. The second one is a short passage on the meaning of the *sāvitrī* formula and on the way of reciting it. It is noteworthy that 4,18–21 (KenaU) and 4,22–26, which form two neighbouring portions, contain the same sentences of the teacher’s giving an *ādeśa* ‘instruction’: *tasyaiṣa ādeśaḥ* ‘As to that, there is this instruction’ (4,21,4 [KenaU 4,4] ≈ 4,24,12), and of a dialogue between the pupil and teacher who asks for and teaches an *upaniṣad* ‘doctrine’ respectively: *upaniṣadam bho brūhīti. uktā ta upaniṣat. ... vāva ta upaniṣadam abrūmeti* “‘Tell [me] the *upaniṣad*, sir.’ ‘The *upaniṣad* has been told thee. We told thee the *upaniṣad* about ...’” (4,21,7 [KenaU 4,7] ≈ 4,23,6). Both portions also have enumerations of virtues like *dama* ‘restraint’ in similar sentences (4,21,8 [KenaU 4,8] ≈ 4,25,3).

The Gṛhyasūtras prescribe a formal request for teaching by the pupil to the teacher (pupil: *sāvitrīm bho anubrūhi* ŚāṅkhGS 2,5,11; ĀpGS 4,11,8; BhārGS 1,9: 9,1; BaudhGS 2,5,39. Cf. KauṣGS 2,3,7; ĀśGS 1,21,4; HirGS 1,6,10; ĀgGS 1,1,3: 10,2; GobhGS 2,10,38), and a ceremonial dialogue between the teacher and pupil at the beginning of every lesson or unit in the Vedic learning (pupil: ... *bho anubrūhi*, teacher: ... *te ’nubravāmi* ŚāṅkhGS 2,7,1ff. ≈ KauṣGS 2,4,1ff. Cf. ŚāṅkhGS 4,8; 6.3. pupil: *adhīhi bhoḥ* at every *kāṇḍa* VārGS 5,24–25). The dialogue in the two portions in question seems to reflect such a ceremonial dialogue between the teacher and pupil performed at the teaching of an *upaniṣad* at that (pre-Gṛhyasūtra) time. It is probable that these two portions were composed as a set of texts with the common sentences of the teacher’s giving an *ādeśa* and of the dialogue between the pupil and teacher as a textual device for providing uniformity to the texts. Thus, the KenaU portion (4,18–21) and its succeeding portion (4,22–26), together with the final portion on the *sāvitrī* formula (4,27–28), must be later appendices to the JUB, collected there probably for educational purposes as three teaching units (to be compared with BĀU 5–6, TU 1, and Kaṭha-Śikṣā-Upaniṣad).

Abbreviations

AB	Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa	JŚS	Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra
ĀgGS	Āgniveśya-Gr̥hyasūtra	JUB	Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa
ĀpGS	Āpastamba-Gr̥hyasūtra	KauṣB or KB	Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa
ĀpŚS	Āpastamba-Śrautasūtra	KauṣGS	Kauṣītaka-Gr̥hyasūtra
ĀśvGS	Āśvalāyana-Gr̥hyasūtra	KauṣU	Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad
AV	Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā	KenaU	Kena-Upaniṣad
BĀU	Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad	KS	Kāthaka-Saṃhitā
BĀUK	Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad (Kāṇva recension)	LŚS	Lāṭyāyana-Śrautasūtra
BaudhGS	Baudhāyana-Gr̥hyasūtra	MānŚS	Mānava-Śrautasūtra
BaudhŚS	Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra	PB	Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa
BhārGS	Bhāradvāja-Gr̥hyasūtra	ṢaḍvB	Ṣaḍviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa
ChU	Chāndogya-Upaniṣad	ŚāṅkhGS	Śāṅkhāyana-Gr̥hyasūtra
DŚS	Drāhyāyana-Śrautasūtra	ŚB	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa
GB	Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa	ŚBK	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (Kāṇva recension)
GobhGS	Gobhila-Gr̥hyasūtra	ŚBM	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (Mādhyandina recension)
HirGS	Hiraṇyakeśi-Gr̥hyasūtra	TS	Taittirīya-Saṃhitā
HirŚS	Hiraṇyakeśi-Śrautasūtra	VādhŚS	Vādhūla-Śrautasūtra
ĪśāU	Īśa-Upaniṣad	VārGS	Vārāha-Gr̥hyasūtra
JĀrṣB	Jaiminīya-Ārṣeya-Brāhmaṇa	VaikhŚS	Vaikhānasa-Śrautasūtra
JB	Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa	VSM	Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā (Mādhyandina recension)
JS	Jaiminīya-Saṃhitā or Sāmaveda (Jaiminīya recension)		

References

- [1] Bodewitz, H. W. “Reaching Immortality According to the First Anuvāka of the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa”. In *Dr. B. R. Sharma Felicitation Volume*, pp. 32–42 (English Section). Tirupati: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, 1986.
- [2] van Buitenen, J. A. B. “Notes on *Akṣara*”. *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute*, Vol. 17, pp. 204–215, 1955–56 = van Buitenen [4], pp. 29–42.
- [3] van Buitenen, J. A. B. “*Akṣara*”. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 79.3, pp. 176–187, 1959 = van Buitenen [4], pp. 157–179.
- [4] van Buitenen, J. A. B. *Studies in Indian Literature and Philosophy: Collected Articles of J. A. B. van Buitenen*. Ed. Ludo Rocher. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988.
- [5] Caland, W. et V. Henry. *L’Agniṣṭoma: Description complète de la forme normale du sacrifice de Soma dans le culte védique*. 2 vols. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1906–1907.

- [6] Deshpande, Indu C. “Concept of the Gāyatra-sāman in the Jaiminīya-Āraṇyaka”. In *CASS Studies, Number 5*, [Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class E, No. 7], pp. 49–60. Pune: University of Poona, 1980.
- [7] Howard, Wayne. “The Body of the Bodiless Gāyatra”. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, Vol. 30, pp. 161–173, 1987.
- [8] Limaye, V. P. and R. D. Vadekar, ed. *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*. Vol. I. Gandhi Memorial Edition. Poona: Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, 1958.
- [9] Lüders, Heinrich. “Zu den Upaniṣads. I. Die Saṁvargavidyā”. *BSB*, pp. 278–309, 1916 = H. Lüders, *Philologica Indica* [10], pp. 361–390.
- [10] Lüders, Heinrich. *Philologica Indica. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940.
- [11] Oertel, Hanns. “Extracts from the Jāiminīya-Brāhmaṇa and Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa, parallel to passages of the Çatapatha-Brāhmaṇa and Chāndogya-Upaniṣad”. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 15, pp. 233–251, 1893 = H. Oertel, *Kleine Schriften* [14], I, pp. 5–23.
- [12] Oertel, Hanns. “The Jaiminīya or Talavakāra Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa: Text, Translation, and Notes”. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 16, pp. 79–260, 1894.
- [13] Oertel, Hanns. *The Jaiminiya or Talavakara Upanishad Brahmana: Devanagari text with indexes, prepared from the edition in Roman script of Shri Hanns Oertel by Rama Deva, with an introduction on the history of Samaveda literature by Bhagavad Datta*. [Dayānanda Mahāvidyālaya Saṁskṛta-granthamālā, 3]. Lahore, 1921.
- [14] Oertel, Hanns. *Kleine Schriften*. 2 Bde. Hrsg. von Thomas Oberlies. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994.
- [15] Parpola, Asko. “On the Abnormal Khaṇḍa Divisions of the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa and the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa”. In *Golden Jubilee Volume*, pp. 215–224. Poona: Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, 1982.
- [16] Sharma, Bellikoth Ramachandra, ed. *Jaiminīyārṣeya-Jaiminīyopaniṣad-Brāhmaṇas*. [Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series, Nos. 5–6]. Tirupati: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, 1967.